DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 976 CG 007 668

AUTHOR Farrell, Ronald A.; Morrione, Thomas J.
TITLE Social Interaction and Stereotypic Responses to Homosexuals.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (67th, August 28-31, 1972, New Orleans, Louisiana)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Cultural Images; *Interpersonal Relationship; Males; *Sexuality; *Socially Deviant Behavior; *Social Status; Stereotypes
IDENTIFIERS *Homosexuals

ABSTRACT

This work focuses on the variations in societal responses perceived by male homosexuals in various group settings of interaction and on the relationship of these responses to their social status and related behavioral characteristics. Conclusions were based on the analysis of data collected from a sampling of 148 male homosexuals in and around a large midwestern city. These are as follows: (1) stereotypic responses are more likely to occur under the interactional prescripts characteristic of secondary groups due to their impersonal and one-way interaction; and, (2) lower class homosexuals are more likely to perceive stereotypic responses due to their closer approximation to the stereotypic image of a homosexual. It is suggested that the display of stereotypic behavior is a manifestation of the lower class homosexual's desire to be identified with the homosexual community. This identification may provide a meaningful self definition and an opportunity for upward mobility unattainable in the larger society. (Author/WS)

ED 070976

SOCIAL INTERACTION AND STEREOTYPIC RESPONSES TO HOMOSEXUALS *

Ronald A. Farrell
State University of New York
At Albany

and

Thomas J. Morrione
Colby College

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CG 007 665

* This is a revision of a paper presented at the 67th Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, New Orleans, 1972. We wish to acknowledge the very helpful comments and suggestions of Professors Stan L. Albrecht, Edwin M. Lemert, Lloyd E. Ohlin, Martin S. Weinberg and Collin J. Williams. Responsibility for the shortcomings of the work, however, rest with the authors.

SOCIAL INTERACTION AND STEREOTYPIC RESPONSES TO HOMOSEXUALS

Introduction

Although societal reactions theorists have emphasized that deviance results from the interaction between the deviant and significant others, most research in this area has paid little direct attention to the nature of this interaction or to the structural elements surrounding and influencing it. Instead, the focus has been on the effects of such interaction on the self definition and behavior of individuals. Pointing out this general problem in Homosexuals and the Military, Williams and Weinberg (1971: 182-183) suggest that it is probably caused, at least in part, by the lack of adequate research methods to handle the dynamics of social interaction, a problem that is generally inherent in research based on the body of sociological theory from which this approach to deviance has been drawn, namely that of symbolic interactionism. In any event, it is suggested that more attention should be given to the kinds of interaction that occur between the deviant and those around him. Although adequate methods are not presently available to handle the more dynamic aspects of interaction (i.e., the process by which symbols are created and communicated and shared meanings developed), this research addresses itself to the problem by dealing with the less dynamic structural elements impinging on this process. In so doing, the analysis focuses on: (1) the variations in societal responses perceived by deviants in different group settings of interaction; and, (2) the relationship of these responses to their social status and related behavioral characteristics.

The Literature

Among those known to have committed deviant acts, only a segment is labeled deviant, and of those labeled, there are significant differences with regard to the severity of the negative reactions experienced. Thus, the likelihood of a definition of deviance and more severe societal reactions seems to show systematic variation among different groups and depending upon different circumstances.

Social Distance

The first question to which we address ourselves is whether stereotypic responses to deviance are more likely to occur in primary or secondary group settings. This question is not easily answered in the existing literature. Rather, in this area we find a limited and somewhat contradictory body of evidence. On the one hand, studies show that the labeling process is more likely to occur in intimate primary group relations, while on the other, there are those who hold that impersonal secondary group contacts are more subject to such responses.

Data that may be interpreted as support for the first point of view are offered by Mechanic (1962), who found that the definition of mental illness is more likely to be made in primary groups, and by Strerfert (1965) who reports that attitudes toward a deviant group member become more unfavorable as interaction distance decreases. Implicit in these findings is the notion that those in regular and intimate contact with the deviant find it more difficult to accept him than those who are not required to share his stigma or spend a great

deal of time exerting tact and care regarding it.

Those who hold that impersonal contacts between strangers are particularly subject to stereotypic responses, on the other hand, view such responses as a form of limited, almost "one way" symbolic communication, characterized by an absence of reaction on the part of the individual being stereotyped (see especially Goffman, 1963: 51-52). Goffman states that as persons become more familiar with each other this categoric approach recedes and gradually sympathy, understanding, and a realistic assessment of personal qualities takes its place. He points out that people with a bodily stigma, for example, report that "normals" with whom they interact gradually come to accept or ignore the disability, so that something like a daily round of normalization may occur. Although there are bound to be instances wherein persons experience more rejection in primary group relations, the notion that stereotypic responses are largely a secondary group phenomenon is most consistent with the interactionist perspective and would seem to apply in most instances of social deviance (Support for this view is also offered by Rubington and Weinberg, 1968).

Social Class

A point which clearly stands out in the empirical literature is that lower class persons are differentially susceptible to the labeling process. Synthesis of the findings and logical implications of this literature suggest that this is a result of a combination of at least three influences: (1) the subcultural groups in which lower class persons interact reject those who are deviant more than do those of the

middle class (e.g., see Kitsuse, 1962: 101;[1] and Dohrenwend and Chin-Shong, 1967[2]); (2) those responsible for enforcing the norms differentially apply more negative sanctions to lower class persons (e.g., see Gallo et al., 1966: 740;[3] and Farrell, 1971[4]); and, (3) the personal characteristics of lower class persons, and the circumstances under which they conduct their behavior, are more likely to bring their deviations to the attention of others (e.g., see Leznoff and Westley, 1955; 260; and Myerhoff and Myerhoff, 1969). Related to these latter findings is also evidence which suggests that the likelihood of a definition of deviance and more severe societal reactions is greater when the behavior increases in: (1) intensity (Terry, 1967); (2) frequency (Mechanic, 1962; Terry, 1967); (3) visibility (Mechanic, 1962); and, (4) unfavorability of the place and situations in which acts occur (Terry, 1967); at least most of these are behavior patterns that seem to be more prevalent among the lower classes.

Propositions

Based on the existing literature and its theoretical implications, then, the following propositions were set forth:

(1) Because of interactional factors, stereotypic responses to deviance are more likely to occur in secondary, as opposed to primary, group settings; and,

(2) Lower class persons are differentially susceptible to stereotypic responses because of: (a) their subcultural associations; (b) discriminatory enforcement patterns by the middle class; and, (c)

their personal attributes and the circumstances which they conduct their behavior.

The Sample

These propositions were tested by using data collected from a sampling of 148 male homosexuals in and around a large midwestern city.[5] The data were obtained as part of a broader social psychological study and through the use of a questionnaire distributed through four homosexual bars and social clubs,[6] through two different organizations for homosexuals, and through individual contact with persons from various social class backgrounds. By tapping into the homosexual community at the various organizational and social class levels and taking whatever cases came to hand, it was felt that a total sample of cases would be obtained that more nearly resembles the homosexual population.[7] As a means of complementing this method of data collection, a period of roughly one year also was spent conducting field study in the homosexual community.

In the absence of true probability sampling, little can be said of the representativeness of the sample. However, although the sample appears skewed in some respects, the objective of obtaining subjects from a variety of social backgrounds seems to have been at least generally attained.

Social Characteristics of the Sample

Occupation and Education. Six percent of the sample were major professionals and proprietors of large businesses; 14 percent, lesser

professionals and business managers; 16 percent, administrative personnel, owners of small businesses, and minor professionals; 18 percent, clerical and sales workers, technicians, and farmers; 4 percent, skilled manual employees; 14 percent, semiskilled employees; and 12 percent were unskilled workers, persons with nonrespectable occupations, or unemployed. The remaining 16 percent were high school, college, and graduate students. With regard to education, 28 percent of the sample were college graduates (10 percent had completed a graduate degree and another 18 percent had a baccalaureate degree), 38 percent had some college, 27 percent were high school graduates, and 7 percent had not completed high school.

Age, Race and Religion. The large majority of the sample were younger white males. Ninety-four percent were white. Fifty-nine percent were under the age of 26, 22 percent were between 26 and 30, and only 19 percent were over 30 years of age. Regarding their religious affiliation, 40 percent were Protestant, 31 percent were Catholic, and 5 percent were Jewish. Twenty-four percent of the respondents did not identify themselves with a formal religion.

A comparison of these data with the Bureau of Census figures on the urban male population showed our sample to be younger, disproportionately white, more educated, and consisting of more persons from the higher level occupations. A comparison on religion also seem to indicate that the sample consisted of a disproportionately large number of persons who claimed no formal religion.

Methodology

The composite scales to tap the various concepts were first

developed from information obtained from the existing literature and field study. The items were then revised after pretesting the questionnaire. Following the return of the 148 questionnaires, each scale's items were tested for their internal consistency and those with low reliability levels were omitted. Scale scores were then computed for each person based on his combined response to a given scale's items. For each of these scales, the median has been established as the cutting point between the high and low scores. (The rationale for operationalizing each concept and the scale items and their alpha coefficient are given in the footnotes.)[8]

In dealing with the issue of the use of significance tests with nonprobability samples, we have followed Winch and Campbell's (1969) and Gold's (1969) suggestions that the chi-square test be reported for the reader's information, and then have supplemented this test with a measure of association as suggested by Duggan and Dean (1968: 46). Cramer's V has been selected as the measure of association since it can attain unity regardless of the size of the table being tested.[9]

Results

Social Distance

The first proposition holds that because of interactional factors, stereotypic responses to deviance are more likely to occur in secondary, as opposed to primary, group settings.[10] Judging from the findings of this study, this proposition appears to be supported in the case of homosexuality. Table 1 shows the relationship between the perceived

reactions of others and the group setting of interaction. The figures show that 76 percent of the sample fell into the "acceptance" category in reporting on the reactions from "people who knew them" (i.e., members of their primary groups). Unlike this situation in primary group relations, 50 percent perceived "acceptance" in their more impersonal public encounters. Furthermore, the data show that 21 percent of the sample perceived rejection in secondary group settings, while only two percent reported such responses in primary group encounters. Accordingly, the area of stigma, at least in this instance, is something that pertains primarily to public life, to contact between strangers and mere acquaintances---generally to secondary group relations.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

These findings may be explained in terms of symbolic interaction theory (see especially Blumer, 1966 and 1969; Morrione, 1971; Rubington and Weinberg, 1968; Turner, 1962; and Wilson, 1970). According to the interactionist perspective, human association is a continual process of interpretation and reinterpretation of indications. On the basis of their interaction, people form meanings upon which they act; they define the situation through the interaction process. Impersonal contacts, however, are representative of incomplete interaction. In essence, what is lacking and the factor which facilitates stereotyping is the "feedback process" in the interaction (Buckley, 1967). Stereotypic responses are almost unidirectional, with an absence of opportunity for reaction by the deviant. When interaction is of this nature, meanings are neither created via the process of definition, evaluation, and reinterpretation, nor do they change as the interaction proceeds. The "interactors" interact only on the basis of the meanings which they

bring into the situation (the stereotype). Impersonal contacts lack the empathic dimension precipitated by reciprocal role-taking.

In impersonal relations the situation might often be exemplified by the following hypothetical dialogue: Stereotyper: "I see you are a homosexual." Homosexual: "I know you see I am a homosexual, but that's only a part of my life. Let me interact with you and explain my case." Stereotyper: "What do you mean explain your case? You are your case!" In actuality these words may never be spoken due to the physical and social exigencies of the situation. However, the net effect of the attitude they represent results in rejection of the homosexual. Impersonal contacts, by definition, and the stereotypes they perpetuate do not facilitate communication based on shared symbols.

When social conditions facilitate face-to-face interaction of extended duration, however, the probability of the emergence of shared symbols or definitions increases.[11] Concomitantly, rationale for divergent definitions held by actors becomes evident to those participating in the interaction and a more "total" perspective of the motives of behavior is obtained. Individuals who can interact on such a non-secondary group level are thus viewed by others in light of a more inclusive ideological and role-expectational system. In this situation stereotypic responses and definitions are de-emphasized, less frequent, and not required as prerequisites for developing meanings.

Social Status

The second proposition states that lower class persons are

differentially susceptible to stereotypic responses because of: (1) their subcultural group associations; (2) discriminatory enforcement patterns by the middle class; and, (3) their personal attributes and the circumstances under which they conduct their behavior. Since the preceding findings seem to have shown that the area of stigma in the case of homosexuality pertains primarily to public life, secondary group responses were used as the dependent variable in testing this proposition. As a first step in the analysis, Table 2 shows the relationship between the social class of individuals and their perceived reaction of others in secondary group settings.[12] Based on this relationship, the data from this study offer support for the proposition. The table shows a very strong relationship between low social class and low perceived societal acceptance. The figures indicate that while 70 percent of the persons from the two lower classes (IV and V) perceived a low amount of acceptance, only 26 percent from the upper classes (I and II) reported such responses.

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Based on the existing literature, the second proposition has suggested that this relationship is a result of a combination of: (1) subcultural; (2) discriminatory; and, (3) personal and circumstantial influences. Although the data from this study do not lend themselves to systematic analyses of these first two influences in the case of homosexuality, it was possible to identify important factors relating to the third. This was done first by examining the relationship between persons' perceived societal reactions to their deviance and the social

image that they presented. This social image was considered in terms of its degree of correspondence with the homosexual stereotype, particularly in regard to overt and effeminate behavior patterns. Thus, a scaled set of items was used which dealt with the personal attributes of the individual and the circumstances under which he conducted his behavior.[13] Again, perceived societal reactions were considered in terms of secondary group responses.

Table 3 shows the relationship between the perceived societal reaction and homosexual image of the members of the sample. The data show that those who possessed additional qualities concurring with the stereotypic image of the homosexual were more likely to perceive low acceptance. The figures indicate that 65 percent of the persons who presented a high stereotypic image perceived low acceptance, while 34 percent of those who presented a low stereotypic image reported such responses.

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Further analysis also showed that the effects of a homosexual image on societal response are confined largely to these more impersonal public encounters. It was found that there was very little correspondence between the reactions that persons perceived in primary group relations and their image as a homosexual. Therefore, it is suggested that as normals interact with the homosexual over an extended period of time, they not only redefine the meanings that they had originally brought into the relationship but, as Goffman (1963: 51-52) points out, they also come to accept or ignore even his visable deviation to the extent that interaction proceeds in a more normal fashion.

Next, the analysis addresses itself to the question of whether lower class homosexuals were more likely to present a more stereotypic image. If the data show that this is the case, then it could be inferred that lower class persons are differentially susceptible to stereotypic responses because of their personal attributes and the circumstances under which they conduct their behavior. Table 4 shows the relationship between the homosexual image and social class of the respondents. The data show that lower class persons were in fact more likely to present a more stereotypic image. While 59 percent of the persons from the two lower classes possessed such characteristics, 30 percent of those from the two upper classes possessed them.

TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

To determine further if overt and effiminate behavior alone might explain the relationship between lower social class and rejection, the original relationship was reexamined while holding homosexual image constant. The results of this analysis showed that the relationship was retained for both those who were high and low in their level of stereotypic image. Thus, it would seem that although the more overt and effiminate behavior of lower class persons contributes to their rejection, it is probably only one of several class related factors that influence this response. As the second proposition suggests, other factors that are presumably operating are: (a) membership of lower class persons in groups that are more likely to reject those who are deviant; and, (b) discriminatory enforcement patterns by the middle class. Unfortunately, the data from this study did not lend themselves to analyses of these proposed influences.

Before accepting even the testable explanation for the second

proposition, however, further analysis was done to determine if the relationship between a high stereotypic image and lower social class might be operating through a third important variable. Simon and Gagnon (1969: 19-20) say that effeminate behavior tends to appear after "coming out" and then apparently diminishes with time.[14] They explain that after "coming out," "many homosexuals go through a crisis of femininity; that is, they act in relatively public places in a relatively effeminate manner and some, in a transitory fashion, wear female clothing . . . This crisis is partially structured by the already existing homosexual culture in which persons already in the crisis stage become models for those who are newer to their commitment to homosexuality . . . The tendency is . . . for this kind of behavior to be a transitional experiment for most homosexuals . . . " Thus, it could be argued that: (a) if effeminate behavior is transitional; and, (b) if the older homosexuals in the sample are from the higher social classes, the relationship between homosexual image and social class may be a spurious one that is in fact operating through age. Given this possibility, it was necessary to explore the joint relationship among these variables. The results of this analysis offer support for Simon and Gagnon's contention. It was found that overt and effeminate behavior (a high stereotypic image) seems to increase at about twenty-one years of age and then begins to diminish after thirty. This is probably because most male homosexuals enter the "gay world" during their early twenties and then decrease their participation in it after thirty. As might be expected, the analysis of the relationship between social class and age showed also that older persons in the sample were more likely to be members of the higher classes.

Thus, these findings support the notion of the importance of controlling for age in analyzing the relationship between homosexual image and social class. This control was introduced by reexamining the relationship within each of four age groups. Table 5 shows these relationships. Although the data are meager in that there are very few cases in some of the categories, they seem to indicate that a high stereotypic image was more likely to be characteristic of the lower classes for all but those between 26 and 30 years of age. Although the relationship is in the predicted direction for this latter age group, persons were or were not overt and effeminate apart from any significant influence of social class. Even after further analysis, the question of why this is so however remains unanswered.[15] Nevertheless, it appears for at least 78 percent of the sample that lower class homosexuals are more likely to perceive a low amount of societal acceptance because they do not exercise as much self possession and are more effeminate in mannerisms and appearance.

TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

Summary and Discussion

Based on the analysis of the data and findings described in the preceding pages, we have concluded that: (1) Stereotypic responses to homosexuals are more likely to occur under the interactional prescripts characteristic of secondary, as opposed to primary groups; and, (2) lower class homosexuals are more likely to perceive stereotypic responses than are upper class homosexuals. Although the data did not lend themselves to analyses of all three factors proposed to be responsible for this latter relationship, it was found that one factor

did have a significant influence. Thus, the data showed that lower class persons seem to have contributed to their rejection by manifesting behavior which is more characteristic of the homosexual stereotype. Beyond the prima faci conclusion that the lower class homosexual manifesting a more stereotypic image is the homosexual most likely to perceive rejection in a secondary group setting, what other conclusions are indicated by this study?

First, it would seem that stereotypic responses are more likely to occur in secondary group settings due to the impersonal and almost "one-way" interaction which characterizes them. When two individuals meet they interact in an attempt to define each other's social positions, roles and statuses. In primary groups, interaction will most likely continue beyond the level dictated by a priori conceptualizations of these elements of social action. In secondary groups, however, there is a relative absence of reciprocated communication directed toward accurate as well as sensitive mutual definition. Such curtailed interaction does not allow one to test his conception or definition of the other via interactional feedback; thus, the process of redefinition or reconceptualization is severely, if not completely, restricted. This situation is similar to what Glaser and Strauss (1964) refer to as a "closed awareness context." In such a context, one interactant does not know the other's whole identity. Thus, the stereotyper who rejects the homosexual in a secondary group setting, rejects him to the extent that stereotyping presents an interaction barrier to continued communication. Social action of the stereotyper in the post-stereotyping period of interaction, then, is most likely to follow a pattern similar to ritualized avoidance. As in any ritualized situation, one then follows the

rules or normative prescripts governing the behavior in the situation; one does not discuss them with the idea of changing them. As the likelihood of reciprocated interaction in the secondary group setting decreases, so also does the probability that there would be acceptance of the homosexual contingent upon the stereotyper's understanding of him.

It might be reasoned further that ritualized avoidance also fosters the development and maintainence of stereotypes. It seems that, subsequent to initial interaction, persistent ritualized avoidance inhibits an actors ability to use symbols that would enable him to understand and accept the deviant. In this situation, the "symbol pool" necessary for understanding and acceptance, as well as the ability to engage in the process of redefinition of symbols itself, may atrophy to the extent that communication in future interaction is severely restricted. This curtailment of input elements into the interaction system may begin at the individual level and then feed back into the normative system of the group. Thus, normative systems taking on these characteristics would be lacking in symbols necessary for more positive interaction with deviants. In this case, individual symbols or the lack of them (as manifested in stereotypic responses and ritualized avoidance) are reinforced and perpetuated by the normative patterns which they foster. This is more likely to occur in secondary group settings due to their greater reliance on existing definitions (i.e., in the case of deviance, stereotypes) for defining situations in interaction.

In addition to the interactional limitations inherently characteristic of secondary groups, attention also was given to another factor which facilitates stereotyping. This factor is <u>social class</u>. The findings of this study showed that: (a) homosexuals from the lower classes were much less likely to perceive societal acceptance; and (b) the difference in

perceived acceptance among the classes may be due to the lower class person's closer approximation to the stereotypic image of the homosexual. Much like the proverbial "pregnant prostitute" mercilessly noted in our abundant heritage of unwritten "humor," the lower class homosexual is most visible due to this closer approximation to the stereotype. Therefore, he is most apt to suffer the consequences of labeling because of the overt manifestation of his homosexuality.

A question which represents an extrapolation of this analysis is, simply put: Why does the behavior of lower class homosexuals more closely approximate the homosexual stereotype than does the action of upper class homosexuals? Although this query may most easily be relegated to the position of "suggested for further research," we would like to offer the following speculation. This is an extension of an explanation offered by some to the effect that upper class homosexuals have "more to lose" and are, therefore, more convert or careful about manifesting behavior which is liable to reveal their homosexuality (see Leznoff and Westley, 1955). Our guess is based on the notion that lower class homosexuals are more prone to identify themselves as members of the "homosexual community." This identification, then, may become a salient factor in influencing subsequent action.[16]

Exhibiting behavior which closely approximates the stereotype may be a manifestation of the lower class homosexual's desire to be clearly identified as a member of his group. In such groups the usual criteria for social differentiation (i.e., occupational and educational levels of achievement) are often de-emphasized and new ones which are more readily accessible are established. Therefore, although close approximation to the homosexual stereotype may facilitate societal rejection, it may also

serve to more positively define the individual's position relative to other homosexuals of similar social background. This identification, in turn, serves the purpose of "crystallizing" his position vis-a-vis other homosexual groups. Such identification locates him in society and gives his action meaning.

Also, the life experiences of the lower class homosexual, particularly occupationally and educationally dependent ones, are relatively restricted. As a consequence, he may think of himself as a homosexual first and as an assembly line worker, a laborer, or a dishwasher second. Furthermore, the alternatives open to a self definition other than the one dependent upon the homosexual criterion may be more "distasteful" or less rewarding for him to consider. Thus, for these reasons, behavior which closely approximates the homosexual stereotype also may provide for a meaningful self definition unattainable in the larger society. The middle class person, on the other hand, usually occupies a number of socially rewarding positions, any or several of which he may identify with. As one such individual explained: "I cannot see myself as a homosexual first. True, it is a very important thing in my life, as anyone's sex life is, but I strive to keep it more than that. I am a homosexual, but I am also an urban designer, a pacifist, a conservationist, a socialist, and a unitarian . . . I have few 'swish' friends and none as partners in sex; I feel I am quite tender and affectionate in a completely masculine way."

Among its other functions, the homosexual community offers the individual social support, the sense of identity, and an opportunity for upward mobility (Hacker, 1971: 86). If the above line of reasoning is

valid, these functions would be of greater importance to lower class homosexuals. The availability of alternative reference groups in which to anchor one's self image and to achieve a sense of identity and opportunity for upward mobility is more pronounced in the case of the upper class homosexual. For the lower class homosexual, association in the homosexual community and definite unequivocal identification as a member of it (via closely approximating the homosexual stereotype) may become a central concern due to the paucity of opportunity to achieve acceptance and a positive self image in the larger society. For those manifesting the stereotype in its most complete nature there exists, at least, the consequent possibility of achieving a "needed" or accepted role in the eyes of other homosexuals. For the upper class homosexual manifesting stereotypic behavior, the results may be disasterous. For the lower class homosexual it is, perhaps, an attractive alternative in view of his position in the larger society.

FOOTNOTES

1. Kitsuse found a relative absence of extreme and overtly expressed negative sanctions against homosexuals among his more educated middle class subjects.
2. Dohrenwend and Chin-Shong report that when both lower and high status groups define a pattern of behavior as seriously deviant, lower status groups are less tolerant.
3. In a study of the legal treatment of consenting adult homosexuals, Gallo, et al., found that a disproportionately small number of the defendants were "professional men," and that in one small upper class community studied there were no arrests for homosexual offenses during a two-year period.
4. This study of the legal treatment of homosexuals showed that a disproportionately large number of persons who were arrested and held for court were from the lower classes, and that they received more severe legal treatment than higher status persons, even when guilty of roughly similar offenses.
5. In 1970 this standard metropolitan statistical area had a population in excess of one million inhabitants.
6. For a discussion of the precendent for such sampling and its implications, see Martin S. Weinberg, "Homosexual Samples: Differences and Similarities," Journal of Sex Research, Vol. 6 No. 4, November, 1970.
7. Altogether 656 questionnaires were distributed, of which the 148 were returned. This gives a response rate of 22 percent. Twenty-two percent of the returned protocols were obtained through organizations for homosexuals, 48 percent from social clubs and bars, and 30 percent through individual contacts. Although the return rate is low, it is

not at all surprising. In addition to the problems of using a lengthy questionnaire and sampling a population whose behavior is subject to strong taboos, in attempting to obtain a more nearly representative sample, methods of distribution were used which lend themselves to low response rates. These include distributing questionnaires under the unfavorable circumstances of the bar situation, and the related difficulties in carrying out any kind of systematic follow-up to encourage persons to return their questionnaires.

8. The items which comprised each scale were selected on the basis of their discriminatory power (see Selltiz, 1965: 184-185) and average intercorrelation value. By using the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient (see Blalock, 1960: 285-299) to obtain this latter value, the correlation values of each item with all other items in the scale were summed and an average taken. Those items with the highest average intercorrelation value and highest discriminatory powers were selected to be included in the final scales. Coefficient alpha was then used to obtain the exact coefficient of equivalence for each composite scale. This statistical procedure provides a measure of internal consistency, taking into account the number of items, by giving the average split-half correlation for all possible ways of dividing the test into two parts. Coefficient alpha is defined as follows:

$$\frac{n}{n-1}\left(1-\frac{\sum_i Vi}{Vt}\right)$$

In this formula, n is the number of items, Vt is the variance of the test scores, and Vi is the variance of the items scores (see Cronbach, 1951: 299).

9. Cramér's V is defined as follows:

$$V^2 = \frac{x^2}{N \text{ Min } (r\text{-}1, c\text{-}1)} = \frac{\phi^2}{M\ (r\text{-}1, c\text{-}1)}$$

In this formula Min (r-1,c-1) refers to either r-1 or c-1, whichever is smaller (see Blalock, 1960: 230). Although it is not possible to attach a precise meaning to Cramér's V, since the values for this measure will range from 0 to 1 even in those instances in which the number of rows and columns are not equal, it serves as a very useful measure for comparing the relative strength of the relationships in different tables.

10. Perceived societal reactions were considered in terms of the patterned and recurrent experiences of social acceptance or rejection in informal encounters. With this in mind, two scales were developed, one to tap primary group reactions and the other for secondary group reactions.

The scale of perceived primary group reactions was based on Cooley's (1909: 23-24) classical description of the primary group which emphasized the features of intimacy and mutual identification characteristic of the family, play group, neighborhood, and community. Since we were dealing with adults, we substituted the more appropriate work group for Cooley's play group. The items that comprised this scale were as follows: (1) please indicate what each of these groups

or persons think of you (think very well of me; think well of me; do not accept or reject me; think poorly of me; think very poorly of me): (a) Your community acquaintances; (b) your neighbors; (c) people you work/worked with; (d) your relatives. Now indicate how friendly or unfriendly each of these groups or persons is toward you (very friendly; friendly; somewhat friendly; somewhat unfriendly; unfriendly; very unfriendly). (Alpha coefficient = .66).

The perceived secondary group reaction scale attempts to deal with informal public encounters. Adjectives used in the literature on symbolic interactionism that are thought to describe responses to deviance in impersonal relations were used in constructing the statements that make up this scale (see especially Cooley, 1902: 258-260; and Thomas, 1923: 49-50). Persons were asked to respond to these statements in terms of: agree strongly; agree moderately; agree slightly; disagree slightly; disagree moderately; disagree strongly. (1) Straight people are cold toward me; (2) I have noticed that they wink, shrug, or nudge at one another about me; (3) They degrade me; (4) They laugh at me; (5) Straight people gossip about me; (6) They refer to me as being odd or strange; (7) They call me names such as fairy and queer; (8) I have noticed that they give me "the once over"; (9) Straight people act as though they are better than me. (Alpha coefficient = .91).

11. Although this theoretical proposition may be noted in the writings of many social psychological theorists, it is perhaps most cogently stated by George Homans (1950: 133): ". . . the more frequently

persons interact with one another, the stronger their sentiments of friendship for one another are apt to be."

12. Hollingshead's "Two Factor Index" (combining occupation and education) was used to measure social class (see Bonjean, et al., 1967: 381-385).

13. The homosexual image scale consists of the following items (persons were asked to respond to the first four statements in terms of: very often; often; fairly often; rarely; very rarely; never): (1) One dances "slow" dances with other males; (2) One speaks in the homosexual slang; (3) One uses feminine nicknames when referring to his friends and acquaintances; (4) One wears facial "makeup"; . . . (5) One dresses in women's clothing (almost daily; one or more times a week; once or twice a month; few times a year; on an isolated occasion or so; not at all). (Alpha coefficient = .64). Although some of the items that make up this scale would seem to apply to behavior that would only occur in homosexual groups, it is our impression that they are part of a more general behavior pattern that does, in fact, carry over into public encounters.

14. Having slightly differing meanings in the homosexual argot, Simon and Gagnon (1969: 19) use the term "coming out" as it refers to "that point in time when there is self-recognition of one's identity as a homosexual and the first major entry into exploration of the homosexual community."

15. In attempting to answer this question the sample was divided into two groups; those between 26 and 30 and those of all other ages. Other variables were then identified that were thought to be related

to the development of overt and effeminate behavior. Those considered (among others) were number of years involved in the "gay world," level of homosexual association, and frequency of attendance at "gay" bars. These variables were "run" in relation to the two age groups in order to determine if persons between 26 and 30 were significantly different in any respect. The results showed that there were virtually no differences. Thus the relationship for this age group may have occured simply as a result of sampling error. Further explanation at any rate would only be pure conjecture.

16. There are obviously other explanations for the lower class homosexual's close approximation to the stereotype. One such explanation that deserves to be explored is that such behavior may result from lower class socialization patterns.

REFERENCES

Blalock, Hubert M.

1960 Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Blumer, Herbert.

1966 "Sociological Implications of the Thought of George Herbert Mead." American Journal of Sociology 71 (March): 535-544.

1969 Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Bonjean, Charles M., Richard J. Hill, and S. Dale McLemore.

1967 Sociological Measurement. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

Buckley, Walter.

1967 Sociology and Modern Systems Theory. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Cooley, Charles Horton.

1902 Human Nature and the Social Order. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

1909 Social Organization. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Cronbach, L. J.

1951 "Coefficient Alpha and the Internal Structure of Tests." Psychometrika 16: 297-334.

Dohrenwend, Bruce P., and Edwin Chin-Shong.

1967 "Social Status and Attitudes Toward Psychological Disorder: The Problem of Tolerance of Deviance." American Sociological Review 32 (June): 417-433.

Duggan, T., and C. Dean.

1968 "Common Misinterpretations of Significance Levels in Sociological Journals." American Sociologist 3: 45-46.

Farrell, Ronald A.

1971 "Class Linkages of Legal Treatment of Homosexuals." Criminology 9 (May): 49-68.

Gallo, Jon J., et al.

1965-66 "The Consenting Adult Homosexual and the Law." UCLA Law Review 13: 686-742.

Glaser, Barney G., and Anslem L. Strauss.

1964 "Awareness Contexts and Social Interaction." American Sociological Review 29 (October): 669-679.

Goffman, Erving.

1963 Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Gold, D.

1969 "Statistical Tests and Substantive Significance." American Sociologist 4: 42-46.

Hacker, Helen Mayer.

1971 "Homosexuals: Deviant or Minority Group?" Pp. 65-92 in Edward Sagarin (editor), The Other Minorities. Waltham, Massachusetts: Ginn and Company.

Homans, George.

1950 The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Kitsuse, John.

1962 "Societal Reaction to Deviant Behavior: Problems of Theory and Method." Social Problems 9 (Winter): 247-256.

Leznoff, Maurice, and William Westley.

1955 "The Homosexual Community." Social Problems 3 (April): 257-263.

Mechanic, David.

1962 "Some Factors in Identifying and Defining Mental Illness." Mental Hygiene 46 (January): 66-74.

Morrione, Thomas J.

1971 "The Omission of the 'i': A Clue to Understanding the Link Between Social Action Theory and Symbolic Interactionism." Paper presented at the 1971 Annual Meeting of the Pacific Sociological Society.

Myerhoff, Howard L., and Barbara G. Myerhoff.

1964 "Field Observation of Middle Class Gangs." Social Forces 42 (March): 328-336.

Rubington, Earl and Martin S. Weinberg.

1968 "The Social Deviant," Part I in Deviance: The Interactionist Perspective. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Selltiz, Claire, et al.

1965 Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Simon, William and John H. Gagnon.

1969 "Homosexuality: The Formulation of a Sociological Perspective." in Ralph W. Weltge (editor), The Same Sex. Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 14-24. Originally printed in the Journal of Health and Social Behavior, Vol. VIII, No. 3 (September, 1967).

Strerfert, Siegfried.

1965 "Communicator Importance and Interpersonal Attitudes Toward Conforming and Deviant Group Members." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 2 (August): 242-246.

Terry, Robert M.

1967 "The Screening of Juvenile Offenders." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science 58 (June): 173-181.

Thomas, William I.

1923 The Unadjusted Girl. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.

Turner, Ralph.

1962 "Role-taking: Process Versus Conformity." Pp. 20-40 in Arnold M. Rose (editor), Human Behavior and Social Process: An Interactionist Approach. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Weinberg, Martin S.

1970 "Homosexual Samples: Differences and Similarities." Journal of Sex Research 6 (November): 312-325.

Williams, Collin J. and Martin S. Weinberg.

1971 Homosexuals and the Military, New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.

Wilson, Thomas P.

1970 "Conceptions of Interaction and Forms of Sociolgical Explanation." American Sociological Review 35 (August): 697-710.

Winch, R. and D. Campbell.

1969 "Proof? No. Evidence? Yes. The Significance of Tests of Significance." American Sociologist 4: 140-143.

TABLE 1. PERCEIVED SOCIETAL REACTION BY GROUP SETTING OF INTERACTION

Perceived Societal Reaction (With level of Scaled Score)	Group Setting of Interaction			
	Primary Groups		Secondary Groups	
	n	%	n	%
Acceptance (First Quartile)	(113)	76	(74)	50
Moderate Acceptance (Second Quartile)	(31)	21	(43)	29
Moderate Rejection (Third Quartile)	(3)	2	(19)	13
Rejection (Fourth Quartile)	(0)	-	(12)	8
Not Known	(1)	1	(0)	-
Total	(148)	100	(148)	100

$x^2 = 33.713$ with 3 df $P < .001$

$V = .338$

TABLE 2. PERCEIVED SOCIETAL REACTION BY SOCIAL CLASS

Perceived Societal Reaction	Social Class			
	I and II	III	IV and V	Total
	n %	n %	n %	n
Low Acceptance	(12) 26	(30) 54	(32) 70	(74)
High Acceptance	(34) 74	(26) 46	(14) 30	(74)
Total	(46) 100	(56) 100	(46) 100	(148)

$x^2 = 17.851$ with 2 df $P<.001$

$V = .347$

TABLE 3. PERCEIVED SOCIETAL REACTION BY HOMOSEXUAL IMAGE

Perceived Societal Reaction	Homosexual Image				Total
	High Stereotypic		Low Stereotypic		
	n	%	n	%	n
Low Acceptance	(49)	65	(25)	34	(74)
High Acceptance	(26)	35	(48)	66	(74)
Total	(75)	100	(73)	100	(148)

$x^2 = 14.300$ with 1 df $P<.001$

$V = .311$

TABLE 4. HOMOSEXUAL IMAGE BY SOCIAL CLASS

Homosexual Image	Social Class			
	I and II	III	IV and V	Total
	n %	n %	n %	
High Stereotypic	(14) 30	(34) 61	(27) 59	(75)
Low Stereotypic	(32) 70	(22) 39	(19) 41	(73)
Total	(46) 100	(56) 100	(46) 100	(148)

$x^2 = 10.981$ with 2 df $P<.01$

$V = .272$

TABLE 5. HOMOSEXUAL IMAGE BY SOCIAL CLASS AMONG DIFFERENT AGE GROUPS

	20 years of age and under (n=30)			21-25 years of age (n=57)		
	Social Class			Social Class		
	I and II	III	IV and V	I and II	III	IV and V
	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %
High Stereotypic Image	(0) 0	(4) 44	(7) 44	(1) 10	(21) 72	(12) 67
Low Stereotypic Image	(5) 100	(5) 56	(9) 56	(9) 90	(8) 28	(6) 33
Total	(5) 100	(9) 100	(16) 100	(10) 100	(29) 100	(18) 100
	x^2 = 3.475 with 2 df P<.20			x^2 = 12.573 with 2 df P<.01		
	V = .340			V = .470		

	26-30 years of age (n=33)			31 years of age and over (n=28)		
	Social Class			Social Class		
	I and II	III	IV and V	I and II	III	IV and V
	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %
High Stereotypic Image	(8) 53	(8) 67	(4) 67	(5) 31	(1) 17	(4) 67
Low Stereotypic Image	(7) 47	(4) 33	(2) 33	(11) 69	(5) 83	(2) 33
Total	(15) 100	(12) 100	(6) 100	(16) 100	(6) 100	(6) 100
	x^2 = .609 with 2 df P<.50			x^2 = 3.591 with 2 df P<.20		
	V = .136			V = .358		